



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Plácido ardor fecundo,
Y te elevas triunfante,
Corona de los orbes centellante." ¹⁵

(ll. 29-35.)

It may be well to add that these two citations from the Spanish poem are taken from the first third of it, while nearly all of those allied to the Ossianic matter occur in the later part of the composition. If these parallels to "Manfred" are to be taken seriously, one might perhaps hazard the guess that Espronceda caught the first suggestion of a hymn to the sun from his favorite, Byron, and that he then filled out his poem with ideas taken from Ossian. This would help to explain why he happened unintentionally to versify the very passage from Ossian that Byron put twice into unpublished verse. And yet these Ossianic poems of Espronceda's belong to his earlier and relatively un-Byronic period; and Ossian, an older force in European literature, may well have been not only the most important source for the hymn to the sun, but also its earliest inspiration; and "Manfred" may have come second in time as well as in importance.

PHILIP H. CHURCHMAN.

Harvard University.

THE SOURCES AND AUTHORSHIP OF *THE THRACIAN WONDER*.

In *Modern Philology*, January, 1906, Mr. J. Q. Adams published an article ¹ showing that the play, *The Thracian Wonder*, the earliest known copy of which is dated 1661, is based primarily upon Robert Greene's pastoral romance *Menaphon*, first published in 1589. Mr. Adams explains the resemblance, however, on the usual basis of the borrowing of one author from another, and so discounts any probability that the play is by Greene himself. More recently in *The Modern*

Language Review,² Mr. J. Le Gay Brereton, evidently unacquainted with the earlier article, puts forward Mr. Adams's first view, but argues in some detail for Greene's authorship of the play. It is the purpose of the present writer to present various resemblances between *The Thracian Wonder* and works of Greene other than *Menaphon*, and on this enlarged basis for inferences, to discuss Greene's relation to the play.

It has already been made clear that the main plot of *The Thracian Wonder* is substantially that of *Menaphon*. In both a cruel king accuses his daughter and her husband unjustly, setting her adrift with her child in one boat, and her husband in another, and putting them out to sea, whence in time, without knowing each other's fate, they come to the same shore, both take to the shepherd life and guise, meet and without recognition, and again fall in love with each other. The child, being stolen away, grows up in a foreign court, is loved by the king's daughter there, and later hearing of the beauty of the fair shepherdess, his mother, comes to pay court to her, as does her father, the king, neither of them guessing her relationship to himself. Through her father's contrivance she is stolen away from the shepherds, who at once go to recover her by storming the king's castle, and after much parley and complication all identities are disclosed, all wrongs are forgiven, and everybody is made happy. So far the *Menaphon* plot holds sway.

It is worth noting, however, that the resemblance between Greene's *Orlando Furioso*³ and *The Thracian Wonder* is hardly less striking than that between the latter and *Menaphon*. Indeed, although the *Menaphon* motive is the more fundamental, *The Thracian Wonder* is a fairly even compound of *Menaphon* and *Orlando*; for the latter not only provides the chief substance for the comic sub-plot, but influences the main-plot in significant and fructifying ways, such deviations from the *Menaphon* material as occur

¹⁵ Cf. also "Sardanapalus," II, i, 14-17:—

"But oh! thou true Sun!
The burning oracle of all that live,
As fountain of all life, and symbol of
Him who bestows it. . . ."

¹ Greene's "*Menaphon*" and "*The Thracian Wonder*."

² *The Relation of "The Thracian Wonder" to Greene's "Menaphon," Modern Language Review*, October, 1906.

³ It should be said that Mr. Brereton has called general attention to resemblance between the ravings of Palemon and those of Orlando, though the point was not developed and the larger resemblances between the plays were not noted.

being almost invariably in the direction of closer resemblance to the *Orlando*. All three plots agree in having a king accuse his daughter wrongly for her love and drive her from his court, as also in her taking the guise of a shepherdess, her later being proved innocent, being forgiven by her father and being restored to her lover (or husband). It is the *Orlando*, however, not *Menaphon* which, as in *The Thracian Wonder*, makes the lover the scion of a royal house, so that any wrong done him has political consequences, and must be answered for by one state to another; and, indeed, a considerable proportion of the dramatic complication in *The Thracian Wonder* results from the adoption of this device. Thus Radagon, who has been secretly married to the king's daughter Ariadne, is not, as in the case of Maximus in *Menaphon*, an obscure shepherd whose base birth wins the king's scorn, but like Orlando, a prince who, fired by tales of the lady's beauty, has braved all dangers and difficulties to win her hand. There is close resemblance also between their proud and princely avowals of their allegiance to their love. So too, in both cases, when wrongs are visited upon them, ambassadors come to demand redress, and there is even considerable resemblance in the more trivial details of the scenes where the latter present themselves:—in each instance they arrive somewhat confusedly without guides or ceremony, and are forced to wander about in order to discover the whereabouts of the king whom they seek. Their wrongs are presented, too, in much the same way in both plays,—these scenes being, of course, lacking in *Menaphon*, because there the lover is obscurely born—and in each case the sovereign offers full redress and ends the audience amicably, although in *The Thracian Wonder* the action is drawn out to include some preliminary resistance of their demands on the king's part. It is evident that the author of *The Thracian Wonder* recognized in the *Orlando* motive here a helpful suggestion for multiplying and quickening the dramatic activities provided for his main-plot by the *Menaphon*.

It is in the comic sub-plot, however, that the contribution of the *Orlando* is most evident. The madness of the *Orlando* hero is diverted to this plot and becomes its central interest, although used in combination with the motive duplicated

from the main-plot, of a lady scorning her shepherd lover. This lover, Palemon, like Orlando, goes mad for love and is watched over by his brother, Tityrus, in much the same half-affectionate, half-amused spirit as that which Orgalio shows towards Orlando. Both guardians at times find their task too difficult and hire clowns to help them divert their charges. In both plays, too, the clowns rehearse the vagaries of the madmen, then tease and anger them by levity, later get beaten by the madmen and themselves complain of ill usage. In each play, too, the clown pretends to be the madman's lady, deceiving him into the utterance of compliments and endearing terms; in each the madman fights in the mistaken belief that his lady has been stolen, talking meanwhile in high mythological strain of the wrong done him and the vengeance he will wreak upon her enemies and his, and alarming his friends for their safety, as well as his own, since he mistakes his friends for his imaginary foes. As in the *Orlando*, too, the madman in *The Thracian Wonder* is healed by the ministrations of a woman, and in spite of the greater elaborateness of the *Orlando* scene of healing, the general contrivance and handling of the two situations and the conduct of the patient are much the same—he is drowsy, murmurs dizzily and confusedly, feels vaguely at first the spell of the music, then rouses to full consciousness and recognition, receiving the assurance of his lady's love and all other explanations necessary to his full happiness and understanding. Certainly there is not much in the comic sub-plot of *The Thracian Wonder* which cannot, either by identity or by close resemblance, be traced to the *Orlando Furioso*.

There is one scene in the sub-plot of *The Thracian Wonder*, however, which is, not only in material but in mood and movement, so intimately like that of Greene's *James IV*, act iv, sc. 3, that one cannot escape the inference of some direct connection between the two, although the situation is of the more or less conventional sort. In *James IV*, the waggish Slipper making ready to charm the fair sex, is deep in discussion with tailor, shoemaker and cutler, all busy devising his adornment, while he exults in the thought of his triumphs. Andrew, a cleverer wag, seeing him in this glib state of exaltation, brings forward certain

merrymakers to divert Slipper's attention by music and dancing, and then, while Slipper is absorbed with these, picks the latter's pocket and runs off with all the money wherewith tailor, shoemaker and cutler are to be paid, thus shattering the hopes of the would-be gallant, who soon discovers his loss, cries out at first in angry distress, and then rallies into more cheerful thoughts of punishing his deceiver. So in *The Thracian Wonder* (IV, 2), Antimon, the merry-hearted vain old shepherd, decked for feminine conquest, considers this or that detail of his toilet, and calls urgently for a mirror, inquiring anxiously as to the effect of his garments and boasting that he is at last to prove irresistible to the lady of his heart. Meanwhile, his companion, the clown, seeing him entirely open to flattery, suggests that if he wears this bravery now before he sees his lady, he will be hopelessly beset by other fair ones, and so persuades him to exchange it temporarily for a simpler garb. No sooner is this done, however, than the clown snatches up the finery and runs away, leaving Antimon, like Slipper, to rail, at first in indignant despair, and then good-naturedly with threats of vengeance.

Another and perhaps less significant parallel obtains between *Alphonsus* and *The Thracian Wonder*. In the first, the hero, before he will help Belinus fight for the crown of Aragon, extorts from the unsuspecting monarch the promise that he himself may claim as his own whatever he captures in battle, meaning to lay hold of the actual Aragonese crown. Then with surprising accuracy and promptness he carries out his intentions, and at once reports to Belinus, diadem in hand, to have his rights of capture confirmed. In vain Belinus insists that his promise admits of no such interpretation; the triumphant Alphonsus will brook no denial. In the corresponding scene in *The Thracian Wonder*, Serena declares all favor to Palemon's love impossible until he gives solemn promise to perform a certain unexplained task. Then when the promise is given, she explains that he must not speak of love again or even look upon her without her consent, thus turning his oath to his own undoing in the very cause on which he is bent; and no amount of protest will bend her from claiming the fulfilment of his promise.

In the general stylistic features of the play, too,

as well as in actual material and plot handling, there is a good deal which is suggestive of Greene. Indeed, nearly all the tendencies ascribed to him by Grosart and Prof. Collins may be detected here—not only the more Marlowesque features of the pseudo-historical main-plot, the absurd array of kings, the prevalence of mythological allusions, the bombastic declamatory speech, but the effective lightness and popular appeal of the comic subplot, the genuine pleasure in the rustic setting, the recurrence of the "repentant note" and various other, though less marked traits.

Nor is it difficult to cite parallel passages which not only follow similar lines of thought and scene handling, but move with a similar sweep and spirit of rhythm. Take, for example, the passage in which Palemon woos Serena (*The Thracian Wonder*) in comparison with Edward's declaration of love to Margret in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*:

The Thracian Wonder, I, 2.

Pal.

"I'll pluck the moon from
forth the starry throne,
And place thee there to
light the lower orb;
And if stern Pluto offer to
embrace thee,
I'll pitch him headlong
into Phlegethon.

.

Or if thou'lt live, and be
the shepherd's queen,
I'll fetch Senessa from the
down of swans

To be thy handmaid: the
Phrygian boy,

That Jove so doated on,
shall be thy page,
And serve thee on his
knee:

Thou shalt be guarded
round with jolly swains
Such as was Luna's love
on Latmus' hill:

Thy music shall surpass the
Argus'-tamer;

If this content thee not,
I'll dive into the bottom of
the deep,

And fetch thee bracelets of
the orient pearl;

The treasure of the sea
shall all be thine."

Friar Bacon and Friar

Bungay, III, 1

Edward.

"I tell thee, Peggie, I will
haue thy loues;

Edward or none shall con-
quer *Margret*.

In Frigats bottomd with
rich *Sethin* planks,
Topt with the loftie firs of
Libanon,

Stemd and incast with
burnisht Ivorie,
And ouerlaid with plates of
Persian wealth,

Like *Thetis* shalt thou
wanton on the waues,
And draw the Dolphins to
thy louely eyes,

To daunce laoltas in the
purple streames;

Sirens, with harpes and
siluer psalteries,

Shall waight with musicke
at thy frigots stem,

And entertaine faire *Margret*
with their laies.

England and *Englands*
wealth shall wait on thee,

Brittaine shall bend vnto
her princes loue,

And doe due homage to
thine excellence,

If thou wilt be but *Edwards Margret*."

One must remember, of course, that parallel passages lend themselves, with suspicious haste, to almost any theory set forth and that contradictory theories easily take shape where one emphasizes likeness and another difference. There is general resemblance to Greene, however, and considerable suggestion of the more elusive, subtler sort in one of the lyrics of *The Thracian Wonder*, Palemon's song to Serena (I, 2) :

"Art thou gone in haste?
 I'll not forsake thee ;
 Runn'st thou ne'er so fast
 I'll o'ertake thee :
 O'er the dales, o'er the downs,
 Through the green meadows,
 From the fields, through the towns,
 To the dim shadows.

 All along the plain
 To the low fountains,
 Up and down again
 From the high mountains, &c."

Certainly Greene might have written this so far as spirit and movement go. Moreover, while the play bears various marks of the earlier Elizabethan drama, it is clearly not by any well-known dramatist of that time—Kyd, Marlowe, Peele, Lyly, or any of the rest—so that it would seem that if any of that group wrote it, Greene was the man.

And yet when all is said, one cannot feel that the play—at least in its present form—is Greene's. It is hard to conceive of one dramatist as borrowing so intimately and so extensively in detail from another, as a different author for *The Thracian Wonder* must necessarily have borrowed from Greene ; but it is perhaps even more improbable that Greene would thus fully have duplicated his own material, fond as he was of repeating himself, and it has been the chief purpose of this paper to show that *The Thracian Wonder* in its plot is practically compounded from Greene's accepted works. There may be passages, too, where Greene's versification at its best, his purest lyric quality and his most musical touch could be granted, but there are many more in which he may not be traced in any stage of his development. It is, indeed, for the most part better than his worst and worse than his best, being stricter in its observance of certain simple metrical proprieties,

much fuller of broken and run-on lines and in other points of technique more skilfully constructed, but lacking, except in rare instances, in a certain native limpidity and freshness which gratify us in Greene's verse in spite of its frequent crudity.

Indeed, it is largely because the play as a whole is not redolent of Greene's spirit that we must look elsewhere for its author. It lacks the frank exuberance of his early Elizabethan ardor, his joy in his many kings and their marvellous doings, his unrestrained naïve delight in what a later age came to smile at half cynically. Marvels like his do come to pass in the play, but they come as the cold dramatic conventions of the time and not as the natural expression of a time when faith and imagination were young. The kings talk as gloriously as did Alphonsus or Tamburlaine, but they do not believe in themselves, because the author does not believe in them, and the sublimity of real self-trust which inevitably commanded a certain respect for the earlier heroes gives way in our minds to an amused contempt. The age of enthusiasm is dead. Indeed, not even the lovers escape the general infection. The serious ones are past genuine passion and with most of them rallery alternates with some slight surrender to feeling. The unquestioning devotion of a Dorothy or a Margret has given way to a certain piquant coquetry and we look in vain for the real tenderness of a love like that between Lacie and Margret.

What, then, must we conclude ? Chiefly this—that the play—in its present form at least—is not Greene's. Such a conclusion leaves open a choice between two possibilities of inference :

1. That it was gotten together by Greene, and later completed or revised by some other dramatist, or other dramatists working in conjunction.
2. That it was rather deliberately compounded from Greene's plays by a close student and great admirer of them.

As to date, the play in its finished form seems to the present writer to belong to the period at the beginning of the seventeenth century, probably that of the earlier decadence of the drama, somewhere between 1600 and 1610. My attention has been called to the fact that (in *T. W.* iv, 2) Antimon,

one of the characters in the play, speaks of "old Menaphon," in a sense which must be interpreted as "well known" or "popular," since Menaphon is distinctly represented by Greene as a youth. The term "old" was in that day somewhat rarely used in this sense, but it is found several times in Shakespeare and so may be thus construed here.⁴ If it is so construed, it suggests that the play builds on some lapse of time since the appearance of the romance, and upon an accumulated popularity of the hero of the latter. This, of course, gives no basis for exact inference as to the date of our play, but it at least suggests that the latter may not have followed very close on the romance. That it belongs to a time anywhere approaching the date of its publication, no one will be at all likely to believe.

O. L. HATCHER.

Bryn Mawr College.

ON THE EDITING OF CHAUCER'S MINOR POEMS.

Among the manuscripts which preserve to us the shorter poems of Chaucer, three are of peculiar interest. They are all contained in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, and are marked respectively Fairfax 16, Bodley 638, and Tanner 346; their Chaucerian texts are printed by the Chaucer Society, and are thus accessible to every student.

Examination of the contents of these MSS. shows a relationship even more striking than editors of the separate poems have noted. Tanner and Bodley, the two smaller MSS., agree very closely in their contents, and their list is paralleled with equal closeness by the first portion of the larger Fairfax volume. All three are, however, independently transcribed, though evidence shows that while Fairfax and Bodley are derived almost entire from one common original (which I shall call FB), Tanner was copied from another codex, either the ancestor or the sister of FB. Of the three Tanner, written by several hands, is the poorest, but Fairfax and Bodley, each written by

one man, are equally careful transcriptions of an original as good as they; while the excellence of their texts shows that the ultimate ancestor of all three codices (which I shall call Oxford), must have been as sound as its worthiest descendants, Tanner's degenerations being of its own introduction.

The lost Fairfax-Bodley, a codex containing at least 17 poems, can therefore be reconstructed with clearness, and its texts of the Minor Poems established; while the lost ancestor Oxford, containing at least 11 entries, can also be reconstructed with a high degree of probability, unless proof of contamination with another type should be adduced.

For two poems by Chaucer this group-solidarity is very important, the *Book of the Duchess* and the *House of Fame*. The former poem remains to us in these three Oxford MSS. alone, the latter only in Fairfax, Bodley, and the degenerate Pepys 2006, see *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xix, 196. An editor of either of these poems or a student of Chaucer's four-beat verse should therefore reconstruct either Oxford or Fairfax-Bodley as his text; but when he has accomplished this, he has obtained the readings of only one type of MSS. Should emendation seem necessary, it must be made from knowledge of the usual trend of error in FB or in Oxford, and that knowledge can only be obtained from a reconstruction of all the texts contained in the lost codices.

The frequent procedure of editors has been a spring from the existing copies to a lost archetype "X"; but in this Oxford Group of MSS. we have material for another mode of treatment, the distinct conception of each individual copyist and his weaknesses. Were full noting of the scribe's peculiarities carried out also for the remarkable Cambridge MS. Gg iv 27, the direct antagonist of the Oxford type, we should have material for a final opinion on the text of one of the Minor Poems, the *Purlement of Foules*; at least, we should be better able to judge which type may have preserved Chaucer's retouchings. Cambridge's possession of the unique version of the prologue to the *Legend of Good Women* is balanced by Oxford's preservation of the *Book of the Duchess* and the *House of Fame*; Oxford's inclusion of non-Chaucerian poems is paralleled by Cambridge's inclusion of the *Temple of Glass*, etc.;

⁴I am indebted to Dr. Percy W. Long, formerly of Bryn Mawr College, for this explanation.